Lillian & Harold Weisberg
Coq d'Or Press ROUTE 8, FREDERICK, MD. 21701
Code 301 / 473-8186

5/8/70

Mr. Thomas Kelley, Asst Director
U.S. Secret Service
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. Kelley,

The receipts account for 18 and 12 "cubets" of film and a roll of 120, of which only five film were exposed, according to other official records. By the minimum of the various other official accountings, there were not fewer than 45 good pictures. But the receipts add up to a total of but 33, of which two batches of undescribed size are said to have been exposed but show no image. There would seem to be serious contradiction here. I would appreciate it if you could explain this to me.

The wording of these receipts with both autographic and X-ray film, is in terms of film exposed and, apparently, delivered, 11/22/63. This suggests the possibility others were exposed and delivered after midnight.

While the total number of X-rays, 14, agrees with the inventory of the Attorney General's panel, neither accounts for all the X-rays taken.

I therefore ask if there were other receipts or other records, and if there were, I would appreciate copies. I would appreciate any help you can provide in helping me reconcile what there should never have been any question about, the number and kinds of film exposed. Here I remind you that you have not responded to my request for my records on the processing of the film and any accounting of how these two batches ended up, showing no image.

My inquiries of the Navy elicited the response they turned everything over.

There is no existing and available record of how many pictures show no image. I presume the processing record would show this, therefore I renew my request for the processing records. If you have a separate information you can impart, I would like, very much, to find some way of eliminating as many of the existing contradictions as possible.

For a period of time stretched beyond need by the Department of Justice I have been seeking the records of this panel. I have exhausted my so-called administrative remedies, as required by the law. In an excess of caution and in the hope of avoiding the need of going to court, I have taken other steps, but the Department has not responded and give no sign of any intention to respond. Therefore, in the near future, it is my intention to file on this. Legally, I am in a position to do it now. I had also hoped that in this time you might respond to the questions I had asked about the film and that I might have access to the records to which I am entitled access. As I indicated in messages I left for you at your office with Mr. Lowney, should you desire, I will come in and explain

this to you and, if you elect, the other gentlemen. While your agency may have not certain [illegible] legal, it is very [illegible] with materials in which you are the agency of 'paramount' interest. Over and above this, perhaps unknown to you or Mr. Goff, the present administration of the Department of Justice has made special interpretations of the law. While I am satisfied they are wrong and have little doubt I will establish this special interpretation is wrong (and I suggest it is known by the Department to be wrong), the mere fact of their having made it and communicated it to me requires of me certain things I would prefer not to have to cope with. It also requires that I broaden the suit or run certain risks I am not prepared to run. In telling you this and offering to tell you more, I am trying to serve your interest as I understand it from the frank manner in which you gentlemen communicated it to me. I hope you will not think I am taking too great a liberty in suggesting you discuss this with Mr. Goff, who may see in it certain possibilities you may not.

May I also remind you of as-yet unanswered inquiries, the most recent of which relates to the Lt. David Ferrie?

I am hopeful you will find it possible to respond soon.

Sincerely,

Harold Weisberg